DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 544 CS 012 870

AUTHOR Peery, Rebecca
TITLE The Effects of the Shared Writing Process on Reading Comprehension of Second and Third Grade Students.
PUB DATE [96]
NOTE 83p.; M.A. Thesis, Salem-Teikyo University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Grade 2; Grade 3; Primary Education; *Reading Comprehension; Reading Improvement; Reading Research; *Reading Writing Relationship; *Whole Language Approach; *Writing Assignments; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills; Mercer County Public Schools WV; West Virginia (Mercer County)

ABSTRACT

A study determined the effect of shared writing activities on reading comprehension. The subjects, 40 second- and third-grade students from a suburban school in Mercer County, West Virginia, completed the Reading Comprehension Subtest of the Comprehension Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) for grade 2 as a pretest. A control group of 20 students were instructed throughout a 6-week period in a literature-based classroom where activities were limited to a basal format. The experimental group of 20 students also engaged in the same literature; however, they were also instructed in a wide range of writing activities. The experimental group did score significantly higher then the control group on multiple-choice responses based on a variety of comprehension questions. Results indicated that students who practiced and strengthened their comprehension skills by using writing activities displayed a difference in comprehension skills measured by a multiple choice format. (Contains 42 references and 4 tables of data; appendixes contain comprehension questions, writing assignments, and a posttest based on "Charlotte's Web." (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 409 544

The Effects of the Shared Writing Process on Reading Comprehension of Second and Third Grade Students

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate School
Salem - Teikyo University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
the Degree Master of Arts
in Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Peery
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by
Rebecca Peery

CS012870

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Salem-Teikyo University
Salem, West Virginia

This thesis submitted by Rebecca Peery has been approved meeting the research requirements for the Master of Arts Degree.

Date _____ John Curran Thesis Committee Chair

Date _____ Gary McCallister

Date _____ T. E. Blevins

Table of Contents

Chapter 1.

Introduction.....1

Purpose of the Study.....1

The Hypothesis.....2

Limitation of the Study.....2

The Assumptions.....2

The Definition of Terms.....3

Importance of the Study.....4

Chapter 2

Literature Review.....5

Chapter 3

Introduction.....33

Research Question.....33

Nature of the Experiment.....33

Method.....34

Data Collection.....35

Design.....36

Summary.....36

Chapter 4

The Results 37

The Statement of the Problem.....37

Hypothesis Results.....39

The Control Group.....39

The Experimental Group.....39

Comparison of Group Results.....40

About the Comprehension Test.....40

Summary.....41

Chapter 5

Summary.....43

Conclusion.....45

Limitations.....46

Recommendations.....46

Appendix A.....47

Appendix B.....60

Appendix C.....71

Bibliography.....74

Abstract

The purpose of this investigation is to determine the effect of shared writing activities on reading comprehension. Forty second and third grade students from a suburban school in Mercer County, West Virginia completed the Reading Comprehension Subtest of the Comprehension Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) for grade 2 as a pretest. A control group of 20 students were instructed throughout a six week period in a literature-based classroom where activities were limited to a basal format. The experimental group of 20 students also engaged in the same literature; however, they were also instructed in a wide range of writing activities. The experimental group did score significantly higher than the control group on a multiple-choice responses based on a variety of comprehension questions. Analysis done with an independent t-test indicated that students who practiced and strengthened their comprehension skills by using writing activities displayed a difference in comprehension skills measured by a multiple choice format.

Chapter 1: The Problem and Its Setting

INTRODUCTION

Elementary language arts teachers should recognize the importance of integrating the writing process with an increase in reading comprehension. Writing adds a creative and motivating method for enhancing the learning process. The research suggests that educators must do more than simply provide information or force the memorization of isolated facts and skills(Weaver, 1988).

According to research done by Marie Clay, Andrea Butler and J. Turbill and other highly respected professional in the education field, teachers need to teach students with an integrated system of creative writing activities that make each student a part of the literature being explored. Having a student interact with the characters, setting, and plot creates an assertive participant rather than a passive audience to workbooks and dittos where there is only one right answer.

The study will compare students' comprehension rate on literature explored through the shared writing process with the comprehension rate on literature explored through traditional comprehension activities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to determine the effect of the shared writing process on reading comprehension of

second and third grade students, as measured by a reading comprehension test.

The Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study is that reading comprehension will be significantly improved by use of the shared writing process.

Limitation of the Study

This study involved a stratified random sample of forty second and third graders from Memorial Elementary, Bluefield WV. Six weeks of instruction was administered to the students prior to an evaluation of the students' progress. The students met with the instructor five days a week for one hour. The instructor shared one chapter of Charlotte's Web, by E.B. White and involved the students in either shared writing activities or traditional comprehension activities depending on the group to which they are assigned.

The Assumptions

The first assumption: The first assumption is that the second and third grade students from Memorial Elementary form an adequate sample.

The second assumption: The second assumption is that the second and third grade students at Memorial Elementary are typical of most elementary students.

The third assumption: The third assumption is that the instruments used are valid and reliable and that the test results are reported accurately by the students and teachers.

The fourth assumption: The fourth assumption is that the time frame is adequate.

The Definitions of the Terms

Shared writing - A method by which a student shares the actual process of composition, through teacher modeling, through peer interaction, or anywhere where writing takes place in meaningful contexts.

Integration - The process of making a part of a larger unit.

Cognitive - A term dealing with the process of knowing or perceiving.

Comprehension - The ability to translate word symbols into ideas.

Word Recognition - The ability to recognize a visual word symbol and associate it with its correct sound and meaning.

Language Ability - Proficiency in understanding and using language.

Potential - Level at which a student can be expected to read based on his/her comprehension.

Language experience - A reading instruction approach which uses oral & written activities to improve reading skills, especially comprehension.

Communication Skills - Listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Importance of the Study

The importance of the study is to show the relationship, if any, between students' comprehension rate on literature presented through the use of the shared writing process to the comprehension rate on literature presented without the use of the shared writing process. Research has shown that the benefits of integrating reading and writing in the school curriculum adds a creative and motivating method for enhancing the learning process.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In order to address concerns about the inability of students to read and comprehend, many educators have looked for an alternative to the skill, drill process of teaching reading (Allen, 1991). Many children who fail to become literate (or simply achieve high expectations) are victims of the presumption that there is only one effective approach to teaching children to read (Carbo, 1987).

Research has shown that the benefit of integrating reading and writing in the school curriculum adds a creative and motivating method for enhancing the learning process. If there is a positive correlation between writing activities and reading comprehension, this study will provide the structure for meaningful learning.

The first basal readers were introduced in the United States between 1836 and 1894. This program, named McGuffey Electric Readers, was considered an influential innovation to reading education. The McGuffey Readers were focused on vocabulary building based on reading selections with moralistic, patriotic, literary and religious themes(Squire, 1985).

During the period from 1931 to 1960, leaders in American reading instruction developed reforms to various programs. Gray and Gates, two of the influential leaders of this period, stressed new strategies for instruction of vocabulary such as word repetition and rigidly controlled vocabulary. New

strategies also included changes in the content of stories depicting middle-class families and values(Squire, 1985).

During this time much criticism began to arise. One such critique came in 1955 by Flesch, in Squire(1985). He urged that phonics be introduced in early grades as part of reading instruction. Another critique was made in 1964 by Strickland, in Squire (1985). He argued the basal programs needed "sentence variety and literary quality." In the 1970's these two views were incorporated, and basal readers came out with new vocabulary focus and realized content controls. Until the early 1960's the teaching of individual comprehension skills received insufficient focus compared to vocabulary and decoding skills. Many basal series taught discussion questions rather than written activities used to teaching decoding and vocabulary. During the 1960's comprehension skills nationally were very poor(Squire 1985).

In addition, by the 1960's basal reading series were used nationally as the pervasive force in reading instruction. The basal reading series promoted a three reading group format, which was universally adopted in most classrooms. The three groups separated students into below, at or above grade level readers. Also during this period, teachers relied solely on the basal readers to teach reading (Otto, Wolf, & Eldridge, 1984).

During the 1970's and 1980's many criticisms were brought out as to using the basal programs to teach comprehension.

Additionally the Center for the Study of Reading in 1981 demonstrated a need to reinforce comprehension with workbooks, in addition to the already popular vocabulary books. Writing activities were being focused on more intensely now to strengthen comprehension. In 1977, Jeanne Chall called for more use of language process to teaching reading. Chall urged the use of more related writing activities in basal programs (Squire, 1985).

Today as basal programs are still the predominant means of reading instruction, comprehension skills nationally are still weak. Criticisms of the basal series continue to rage. Educators are beginning to look at alternatives to teaching reading both in addition to the basal readers and as replacement to the basal readers.

Throughout the 1970's and 1980's many researchers worked on language processing strategies to enhance comprehension skills. Many of these writing activities could be used in addition to or as replacement to the basal programs.

One method of teaching reading which is designed to address these concerns is the whole language approach. Many articles have been written about how using whole language method of teaching reading affects reading achievement while the whole language approach to teaching reading is not simply defined (Newman, 1985), "many educators do agree that this form of instruction involves the integration of listening, speaking, reading and writing in a pupil-centered classroom

setting" (Shapiro and Gunderson, 1988 p 40). This research is focusing directly on the effects of shared writing and pupil writing on reading comprehension, an essential component on the whole language approach.

The teachers in the Contoocook Valley District in New Hampshire adopted a whole language program, with writing activities was a strong emphasis, to teach reading where no basal or worksheets were used (Robbins, 1990). The results of their instruction included high scores in reading comprehension on the California Achievement Test, an increase in the quality and quantity of books read, and a drop in the number of students identified for special education (Robbins, 1990).

In comparing traditional basal instruction with a shared writing emphasis, Klesius reported "no significant differences between the two instructional treatments" (Klesius, 1991). The primary purpose of Klesius' study was to determine whether a language art experience instruction could be used without a loss in student achievement as measured by a standardized test (Klesius, 1991). While achievement of students taught with a shared writing process did not exceed the achievement of students in traditional classrooms, neither were the scores lower (Klesius, 1991).

Shapiro and Gunderson (1988) did a comparison of vocabulary generated by the first grade students in shared writing classrooms and classrooms that use a basal reading

program. The results of this study indicate that the children in the shared writing classrooms generated more words than would be encountered in a basal reading program (Shapiro and Gunderson, 1988). They also reported similarities between the shared writing classroom's high frequency words and the basal programs vocabulary and the Dolch List (Shapiro and Gunderson, 1988). It was concluded that the vocabulary generated by students in shared writing classrooms was more varied than the vocabulary generated by students in a basal program because the children taught with a shared writing approach have more varied literacy experiences than children taught with a basal approach (Shapiro and Gunderson, 1988).

teaching reading and language led Reutzel and Cooter (1990) to make a comparison study of reading achievement with whole language and traditional approaches. They cited several studies comparing the effectiveness of the shared writing process with traditional reading programs (Heald-Taylor, 1989, Calkins, 1982; Phinney, 1986; Looby, 1986; Riboswsky, 1985; Slaughter, Haussler, Franks, Jilbert, and Silentman, 1985). All of these studies reported findings that favored the shared writing process to teaching reading and language. Reutzel and Cooter (1990) also found significant differences favoring the shared writing process classes over the basal classes on total reading scores as well as on the vocabulary and comprehension subtest scores of Gates-MacGinitee Reading Survey Test A, Form I and the end of the first grade. The conclusion from these

findings is that "whole language appears to be moderately more effective than basal programs in affecting first-grade children's reading achievement" (Reutzel and Cooter, 1990).

Eldredge (1991) also compared student reading achievement in whole language classrooms where a shared writing component exists. The particular approach used in this study incorporated some systematic phonics instruction (Eldredge, 1991). The results of the Gates-MacGinitee Reading Test, Level A, Form I showed that students in this program made greater gains in comprehension and total reading scores than students in the basal program (Eldredge, 1991).

Many educators interested in an alternative to teaching reading with a basal program are also interested in an alternative instrument for comparing reading achievement of students in traditional classrooms and students in classrooms where writing is used to increase comprehension (McKenna, 1990). Historically, standardized tests were developed as a convenience in test construction and scoring (Readence and Martin, 1988). They are used to compare various groups of students' performance at a certain grade level. The typical standardized reading comprehension test consists of a paragraph followed by multiple choice question. However, answering questions about a short selection is only one indicator of reading comprehension. Standardized tests fail to test the reading process (Readence and Martin, 1988). Alternatives to assessing reading include inventories,

observation, having the student retell the story, and having students write about what they read.

One alternative reading comprehension assessment was developed by the teaching staff at the River First Public Schools in Illinois. These teachers had a desire to evaluate the process of reading and developed the River Forest, Illinois Writing in Response to Reading original method of assessment (Farr, 1990). In administering the Reading in Response to writing assessment, the students were given a story prompt from a grade level reading passage and instructed to write the next part of the story. Teachers from each grade level developed criteria for story comprehension, connecting the writing to the prompt, and story structure. They then developed a rating scale for the writing sample of their grades. Writing samples called anchors were selected that represented the ratings of the scale to further assist in evaluating the writing samples. The writing samples were then given a number rating based on the criteria and rubrics (Farr, 1990).

Since reading and writing are both language processes, research has been proven there is a direct relationship between the two. However, this direct relationship does vary within the language process. For example, a large body of research has been completed to prove alternative methods to the development of reading skills. In contrast, little research has been completed to prove alternative methods to

the development of reading skills. In addition, little research has been done in reading to study the influence of writing on the reading process(Stolsky, 1983). Here specifically the influences of directed writing activities on the development of reading comprehension will be discussed.

A study was conducted by Kulhavy, Dyer and Silver (1975) to prove the effects of notetaking on learning text material. The study was conducted on a random sample of 144 junior and senior high school students. The students were assigned an 845 word narrative passage to read and study. The subjects were informed a test would be given on the material from the passage. Prior to reading, the high school students were divided into three groups: those who were instructed to take notes on major details, those who were instructed to underline major details and those who were instructed to read and study.

Systematically, the students were given an unlimited amount of time to read the narrative and take notes, underline or study the text. As the learners finished reading, the passages were collected and a multiple choice comprehension test was immediately administered. Again, no time limit was placed on their working time to complete the test.

The test results supported the researcher's notion that notetaking increases what the learner remembers from the test. Additional data indicates that notetakers spent an increased amount of time studying compared to the other two groups.

Significantly more time was spent on the passage information since notes were required (Kulhavy, Dyer, and Silver, 1975).

Two years later in 1977, Warren E. Combs conducted a study on sentence-combing practices used to develop reading comprehension skills. Sentence-combining is explained by Combs as a method to improve critical reading and writing skills. These exercises begin with a "Kernel" sentence or thought. Next, other relative smaller kernals are listed. The students, beginning with the main kernal, add other listed kernals. They continuously use their linguistic intuition as a guide to write cohesive sentences.

Combs' study was done to determine if training and practice in sentence strategies would transfer to reading comprehension. Combs pretested two groups of subjects at the level of entering college (grade level 11-13) with the Rate and Comprehension Check Test of the Baldridge Reading Instruction Materials. After the pretests, students in the experimental group were instructed in sentence-combing practices aimed at increasing their abilities to handle complex syntactical structure. Following the experimental group's intervention a posttest was administered to both groups. The posttest was about the same in length as was the pretest, between 985 and 1,005 words.

Results of the study showed that the experimental group, after sentence-combining practices, made significant gains in reading comprehension scores. Combs found that syntactic

difficulty in reading passages affects students' abilities to handle more difficult syntax(Combs, 1977).

A third study, on the effects of writing activities on reading comprehension was done by Doctorow, Witthock and Marks, (1978). Doctorow et al used 488 subjects from Los Angeles ranging in ages 10 to 12 years old. The students were placed into two ability groups, determined by the results of the Science Research Associates (SRA) Reading Placement Test scores. The low group would work with a 372 word passage from the lowest level of the SRA Power Building Reading Laboratory Kit. The high group's passage was 1,125 words from the highest level of the same SKA kit. These two groups were divided into four control treatment groups. Each group was instructed on various methods of summarizing paragraph information.

The procedure of the experiment lasted 3 days: day 1 assignment of treatment, day 2 - reading passage with individual treatment, and day 3 - tests of comprehension and recall. The results of the Cloze Recall Test were analyzed as follows. Group 1, who used one word paragraph headings, scored higher than the control group (group 4). Similarly, group 2 who wrote original sentences to summarize events, increased processing of memories compared to the pretest scores. Logically then, group 3, who combined both conditions, scored the highest on the posttest and had the largest growth from the pretest. These results were

consistent in both the high and low achievers, concluding that both types of learners benefit from the same type of writing task, to summarize narrative stories. In total, Doctorow et al (1978) concluded that the retrieval of relevant information condensed into one or two words and the generation of coherent summary sentences increased reading comprehension and recall.

The following three studies deal with college students and their abilities to recall information. All three studies include other writing tasks tested by researchers on various groups of college students to enhance reading skills.

The first of these was done by Kari Taylor, (1978) using college freshmen. This small study was done using 22 freshmen from an English class at Illinois Central College. During a sixteen-week semester, the students were instructed in various types of summary skills. Additionally, they were assigned a total of eight papers to practice each of the following summarizing skills: narration, process, comparison/contrast, definition, summary, cause/effect, classification and problem/solution. The examiner analyzed two written summaries from each student; one early in the semester and the other towards the end of the semester. A maximum of six points were given for each test passage with a focus on accuracy and brevity. According to the pretest scores students had trouble summarizing written passages; responses were often incomplete, lengthy, wordy, and repetitious. In contrast, the posttest passages were concise and accurate. All around scores were

higher than the pretest scores in all eight areas. The mean scores illustrate the growth of a sixteen week semester: pretest mean of 3.3 compared to posttest mean of 4.7 (using a 6 point scale). The implications of this study suggest students are below proficient levels in summarization skills vital to recalling text information. It is suggested that these eight skills mentioned above be taught as an integral part of early subject-matter courses(Taylor, 1978).

The second of the three colleges studies deals with a variety of different writing tasks but concludes similar findings.

Glover, Plake, Roberts, Zimmer and Palmere (1981) used 152 undergraduate subjects to study paraphrasing and drawing inferences on memory recall. The 152 subjects were randomly placed in five groups via the receiving of a pocket containing one of five various sets of directions were as follows:

1. control condition directed to simply read the essay.
2. key word condition subjects were directed to list key words beside each paragraph.
3. model statements condition subjects were directed to use verbatim sentences, paraphrase sentences, logical extensions and logical conclusion (a definition was given for each along with a passage sample).
4. paraphrase condition subjects were directed to paraphrase each paragraph (a sample paragraph was given with an example of a paraphrase).
5. logical extension condition subjects were directed to write original extensions to the material content.

Each of the five groups worked on the assignments for 25 minutes. Upon completion, students were given a 15 minute period to complete a free recall test.

The test results varied greatly among the groups; hence, the resulting discussion is lengthy, and does not com Jacobs completed with this study. Therefore, in summary, the results support that recall is a high level process of encoding information. The assignments requiring students to use more extension condition subjects resulted in higher recall rates. Addition conclusion confer that an increase in task difficulty using more extensive processes resulted in higher retention. The last conclusion was that the subjects who wrote key words and paraphrases also scored high. Thus from this perspective it can be summarized that subjects remembered more information when they provided their own cues (Glover, Plake, Roberts, Zimmer & Palmero, 1981).

This third college study was done as a dissertation by Walker-Lewis (1981). The subjects of the study were 74 academically underprepared college students enrolled in a reading course. The subjects were divided into a control group, whose reading instruction consisted of traditional non-integrated methods, and an experimental group, whose instruction emphasized reading/writing strategies. The subjects wrote a total of six written responses to an investigator constructed reading comprehension test. Various other tests were used to collect data on the subjects such as

the Estes Scales to Measure Attitudes Toward Reading, Dale and Miller Instrument To Measure Writing Apprehension and the Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP) Test III.

As a result of the statistical analysis three distinct findings were made on the two groups. First, the subjects' written responses varied greatly when measured by the investigator-constructed comprehension test compared to the STEP test. Secondly, overall attitudes toward reading and writing increased in the subjects of the integrated reading and writing group. Thirdly, the researcher concluded that when writing was used in instruction the reading comprehension of academically underprepared college student increased. (Walker-Lewis 1981)

In 1983, Jeanne S. Chall and Vicki A, Jacobs completed another study which supports using writing as a developmental tool to strengthen reading. Specifically, Challand Jacobs studied children of low soci-economic status (SES) for a growth period of one year in the areas of writing, language, and reading. The 30 SES students in grades 2, 4, and 6 were categorized as "above average" readers, with third and fourth stanines. Both groups were monitored for a year's growth on acceleration from grade two to three, grade four to five and grade six to seven.

The testing procedures varied between reading and writing. Reading assessment was done by an individually administered test. The battery scored six separate components

of reading, one including comprehension. In contrast to the writing assessment was a group administered test. The test consisted of two writings, one a narrative piece and the other on an expository stimulus; 10 minutes was allotted for each subtest. The writing samples were assessed on twelve various measurements. Two included syntactic organization and content measures, both of which were later related directly to reading comprehension.

The results of the study included various findings about SES students learning patterns of both growth and deceleration. The storing growth was found from the second to the third grade in the area of reading. Additionally, the greatest decline was noted in the grade six "below average" readers in both reading and writing. It was concluded that SES students drop further behind their grade expectation in all areas, especially those of the "below average" reading groups.

In correlation to the reading findings, students with poor syntactic organization and content scores, on the writing test, scored low in reading comprehension. Challand Jacobs conclude there is a definite need for more emphasis on writing since a string link between writing development and both reading and language growths have been determined. (Chall & Jacobs, 1983)

Joe Belanger published a critical review of the research in 1987 in which many studies on reading and writing were

summarized and analyzed. The following are relevant to this study.

One pertinent study discussed by Belanger was done by Taylor and Beach (1984). Taylor and Beach found significant changes in reading and writing measures after teaching a hierarchial summary procedure to a group of seventh grade social studies students. The experimental students were assessed in reading comprehension after reading a passage and writing a hierarchial summary on the passage. In contrast, the procedure of the control group was conventional in that the group read and reread the passage without writing on the passage. Both groups were then asked to complete questions on the same passage read. The group which wrote the hierarchial summaries scored significantly better than the control group on the recall test questions. (Taylor & Beach 1984, in Belanger, 1987)

Another related study from Belanger's publication (1987) was done by Braun and Gordon (1982) on the effects of writing narratives. The study was conducted with a fifth grade class over a period of 15 hours in a five week period. The experimental group received extra instructions in writing narratives compared to the control group who received traditional fifth grade instructions on narrative writing. On the comprehension subtest of standardized reading test, the narrative writing group scored higher than the control group (Braun & Gordon, 1982, in Belanger 1987).

Most recently, in 1989, two separate studies were conducted on methods of strengthening reading comprehension. The first of these was completed by Matha Head, John Readence and Ray Buss on summary writing.

The study administered by Head et al (1989) was conducted with 49 seventh grade subjects. These students were all of average reading abilities, with stanine scores ranging from 4 to 7 with a mean of 5.2. Students were randomly assigned to either a control group or a treatment group which received instructions on summarizing skills. Following ten days of treatment both groups were given reading assignments from history text books to summarize. The passages were 576 words in length with a readability level of seventh grade on the Fry scale. immediately following the reading, the control group was allotted time to write summaries on the text content. Next, both groups were given the same 10 question multiple choice test.

The results of the study proved while learners compose a summary, they must both conduct a review of the topic schema and make decisions about pertinent data to use in their summary. Therefore it is concluded that the cognitive process involved in writing a summary is similar to that which is used to recall text content. Additional conclusions were made regarding the testing procedures. Since students in the experimental group were instructed to use the summarizing technique as a means of retaining content but then asked to

recall the data via a different mode (multiple choice test) it has been noted that the students were also able to transform the text material into usable information. Here again, using a more advanced cognitive process than the control group(Head, Readence & Buss, 1989).

The second 1989 study discussed here was done by Flood, Mathison, Lapp and Singer. Although this research varies from the others listed within this section, it is relevant to comprehension in text books; therefore it has been included. Forty-four graduate students were placed into four groups, which received various types of instruction. Among these groups, one had an instructor who assigned text reading in addition to completing ten reading tasks with the students. Five of the ten are as follows:

1. previewing the chapter before reading is done
2. supplying students with the prior knowledge needed to comprehend the text
3. logically, sequencing the material
4. summarizing the material
5. supporting the material with visual aids

The results of this experiment proved that the students, who received the instruction from the teacher above had significantly higher comprehension scores on chapter content than the other groups. It was suggested in the conclusion of this test that instruction via a text should include interaction between the text, the reader, and the teacher.

Many of these interactions, guided by the instructors, consisted of typed of writing activities which challenged the cognitive processes used to translate the text into usable information (Flood, Mathison, Lapp & Singer, 1789).

Only a few studies reported no positive correlations between directed writing activities and reading comprehension. One such study was done by Oehlkers in a year long test on first grade children. One group was taught with a language experience approach as their reading instruction. The other group was taught with a "creative writing" program as their reading instruction. Oehlkers found no significant difference in the reading level of the two groups at the end of their first grade year (Oehlkers 1971 in Stotsky 1983).

A second study was done by Smith, Jensen, and Dillingofski with fourth graders. The fourth graders were placed into two groups. The experimental group was assigned to complete either a creative or a non-creative writing assignment after reading a short selection. The control group was assigned no writing assignment, just a simple reading test. On a short comprehension assessment administered to each group, there were no significant differences in test scores (Smith, Jensen, and Dillingofski, 1971 in stotsky 1983).

Belanger's review of research in this field, summarized some noteworthy results. Firstly, he notes that two-thirds of the studies completed on sentence-combining methods to improve

reading comprehension found no significant differences in study groups. Additionally, it was stated that most of these successful studies were conducted on the elementary level.

Belanger also concludes in his research review that the reading-writing relationship appears to have different attributes at various grade levels. Younger subjects, going through a rapidly growing language process, score higher than older students with a developed process of comprehending. Here he supports the theory of comprehension as a developmental process (Belanger, 1987).

New Zealand Literacy

Rather than being concerned only with the product, teachers today pay more attention to the processes children are engaged in as they write, and the learning which occurs when children are in control of their writing. Teachers' focus is on helping writers become aware of how and why they write, and on encouraging them to write freely, fluently, and well. Teachers see how being aware of the writing process helps students use writing as a tool for learning. In addition, the emphasis on the process does not mean that the product is unimportant - the aim of writing is always to produce something that can be read (Renwick, 1995)!

In the past, many teachers did not view writing as a complex developmental process (Mooney, 1990). They were not concerned with the finished products, which they evaluated without regard to the way it was produced. Teachers seldom

looked beyond surface features - the weakness of spelling, punctuation, grammar, and usage (Cunningham, 1995). Some, instead of offering just enough help when it was needed, took control away from beginning writers and said, "Tell me your story, and I'll write it for you." So some writers learned only to trace over, or copy under. Writing was seldom considered as a tool for communication, recording, and understanding (Mooney, 1990).

In the early 1980's, following the visit of Donald Graves to New Zealand, teachers took up the idea of "shared writing" with enthusiasm. However, the workshop organization of teaching writing suggested by Graves, in which time was set aside for an intensive writing session each day, was given more emphasis than this underlying philoshopy (Manning, Manning, Long, Wolfson, 1991). Teachers encouraged students process writing freely, but not producing good quality writing, or gaining greater skills in writing across the curriculum. Nor were their skills in writing linked to their developing skills in reading. The root cause was a lack of understanding on the part of teachers of the writing process itself.

New Zealand teachers had long been aware of the need to make reading a child-centered and meaningful experience in which the role of the learner was of critical importance (Renwick, 1995). Now came the realization that the writing process is not a method of organization, a teaching approach,

or something done for six weeks and then put aside. Nor is it something children do for thirty minutes a day only in a writing workshop (Renwick, 1995). Writing, like reading, concerns the development of the child as a communicator of thought and feelings in all areas of the curriculum and for a variety of reasons.

Reading & Writing, Like Talking & Listening, are Inseparable Processes.

Talking and listening are two sides of the act of communication. Reading and writing are as closely linked. Readers use their own knowledge and experience to construct meaning form text; writers to construct meaning in text (Turbill, 1985). To communicate successfully, children need to read like writers and write like readers. They can then see the element common to both forms of expression - that both are purposeful, express meaning, share the same functions, and use the same print convention (Turbill, 1995).

Because writers need to read in order to create and recreate meaning, and to construct and organize thoughts and ideas, reading is an integral part of the writing process (Turbill, 1990). During writing, writers use many kinds of language knowledge in constructing texts, and in organizing their thoughts and ideas. In particular, they reread their scripts to match what has been written with what is intended. Reading, therefore, goes hand in hand with writing. Teachers should make this link clear (Hansen, 1987).

Beliefs & Principles

Words empower people. They enable them to define reality, or create it. In retelling what is read, or in listening to others, in writing experiences down or reading others' words, one enlarge his/her understanding, and increase both knowledge and ideas.

The first and most important use of language is to communicate with others, but it is much more than this. Trying to express what one really means involves the active exploration of ideas. This process involves one in reflective thought and in the selection and arrangement of appropriate language. The practice gained through this experience becomes part of the thinking tools used in subsequent productions - as Golden Wells says, "harnessing the dynamo of language" to power one's own thinking (Lehr, 1981).

People write for many purposes, but usually to record events and ideas, to share with others or to reflect on later. This gives what is written purpose and meaning (Graves, 1983).

Writing takes many forms. The particular purpose for writing and the intended audience influence the way one presents each message and conveys meaning (Lewis, Wray, Rospigliosi, 1994). As experiences with a variety of examples and models grows, one becomes more flexible in choosing the most appropriate forms of saying something, and more skillful in reading the intended audience. The range of linguistic options increases (Hennings, 1982).

Reading and writing are the two sides of the literacy coin. And they should be inseparable in the school curriculum (Elbow, 1993). Teachers have always known that reading is necessary to develop writing, it is only recently that educators are recognizing that writing influences reading (Renwick, 1994).

Traditionally the elementary classroom setting had a reading session and a separate, less emphasized writing session. However, teaching techniques have changed. Currently, reading and writing have began to merge into one happy, stimulating, and pressure-free session. Students who approach both elements of literacy simultaneously experience the language with the lock and the key (Lehr, 1981). Becoming an author as well as a reader empowers the learner. Students can become a part of the literature when they have been a creator of their own literatures. When students are in procession of the elements that weave a story by shared writing, they have the ability to analyze others' stories. Through shared writing children can become confident story writers and story readers(Lehr, 1981).

Students who are in a literature-based language arts program where reading and writing are equally emphasized are provided with an environment where a sense of oneness exists. Students can progress freely, grouping is eliminated along with feeling of inadequacy. Using shared writing to increase

reading comprehension truly individualizes the learning(Varable, 1990).

Moving away from commercial worksheets and workbooks promotes responsibility and time on task. When students are working on an on going shared writing process, the problem of students completing assignments at difference time is eliminated (Holland and Hall, 1989).

Summary

Writing should be part of a balanced reading and language program. Regular opportunities should be provided for children to produce their own written materials which can then be read to others or by them. In the course of writing many drafts, children learn about reading and writing. Through whole language classrooms where the shared writing process encourage these approximations learners become better able to comprehend text.

There is a reciprocal relationship between reading and writing: both are concerned with "meaning" and each one has its own special characteristics. The reader reconstructs meaning from the symbols on the page, attending only to enough of the details of print to ensure understanding. The writer, on the other hand, start with ideas and has to represent these with symbols, and comprehend in order to give meaning to his/her product(Wittrock, M.C., 1983).

Many studies have been done concerning the whole language approach and the specific component of the shared writing

process in the past decade. Although no dramatic conclusions have been made concerning reading comprehension, significant conclusions can be made. Teachers are now appreciating autonomy and creativity that promotes a well-balanced program and provides for the diversity of the children it serves. Students are engaged in a language experience where they are assertive learners and no longer passive learners to isolated skills(Wittrock, M.C., 1993).

In New Zealand a reading/writing program has emerged that has affected educators in the primary setting in the United States. The basic philosophy is a child-centered, print rich environment where learners are actively submerged in quality literature. Students are no longer only the "receiver" of information but are engaged in the understanding of text by experiencing the shared writing process(Wittrock, N.C., 1993).

When investigating thered writing compprocess, a name that is concurrent with New Zealand's reading/writing philosophy is Andrea Butler. Ms. Butler's research supports the shared writing process and its direct effect on reading comprehension. She maintains that reading and writing have interchangeable skills. The results of these findings state that when reading and writing are taught in conjunction, reading and writing complement each other, thus an improvement in both is present (Bulter, 1994). Therefore, elementary school teachers are encouraged to explore ways of combining

instruction in these areas as a means of improving student performance.

Researchers have tried to determine the factors which increase reading comprehension for various reasons, most importantly, implications of such research can alter curriculum developments in reading. Secondly, research findings can be used to guide publishers of reading programs for the most effective selections of teaching aids. Thirdly, researchers of reading instruction can alter teacher training programs to insure the proper preparation of future reading teachers(Wittrock, M.C., 1993).

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a need to supplement current reading programs with writing activities. It is suggested that when writing is included as part of reading instruction, comprehension scores may be significantly higher than those who are not taught reading with writing integration.

Although much has been said about the influence of reading upon writing, little information is available concerning the effect of writing practice upon reading comprehension. According to this study, it is predicted that students who organize their thinking on paper understand better another writer's organization of an idea. This is the essence of reading comprehension. To enhance the transfer of learning between reading and writing, students should see the connection between what an author is saying and what the

writer wants to say. If knowledge gained from writing can transfer to reading comprehension and can make students feel better about themselves as readers and writers, then they may also increase their cognitive growth through the transfer of learning and the shared processes among reading, writing, and thinking.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine whether reading comprehension can be increased by integrating the shared writing process into a literature-based classroom. The shared writing process is used as a tool to enhance the learning process for mastery of reading comprehension. The shared writing process offers students the means to work at their own level and pace without the pressure of testing or failure. Students can engage in the literature beyond simply reading for meaning by becoming active participants.

Research Question

H_0: There is no significant difference in reading comprehension test scores where the shared writing is used.

H_1: The use of the shared writing process integrated into a reading program will increase reading comprehension.

Nature of the Experiment

Population and Sample

The subjects for the study included twenty-four second grade students and sixteen third grade students.

The sample consisted of forty students from Memorial Elementary, a small suburban school of Bluefield, Mercer County, West Virginia. Thirty-five students participating in this study were Caucasians and five students were African Americans. Approximately two-thirds of the students in the sample are from families classified as middle to upper income.

Method

On the first day of testing, the students were given reading comprehension section of the C.T.B.S. as a pretest.

The students at Memorial Elementary were divided into two groups, Group A and Group B. Group A listened as the teacher read the first two chapters of Charlotte's Webb by E.B. White. After the students listened to two chapters, a teacher-designed worksheet was distributed as follow up activities to the chapters read. This procedure occurred twice a week for six weeks. The activities were straight forward assignments that are similar to worksheets that accompany a basal reader. These activities had only one correct answer. The teacher corrected the students' assignments after completion of comprehension activities to monitor progress. (See Appendix A)

The second group of twenty students, Group B, also listened to the literature selection as did Group A; however, after listening to two chapters they participated in a shared writing activity. The activities for Group B were also reading comprehension activities but emphasized comprehension through a shared writing process. The shared writing components were teacher designed to promote a language experience where communication skills and language activities were emphasized. Many activities had a writing prompt where students were actively engaged in the shared reading presented. Each student was encouraged to expand on his/her idea as far as he/she could go. Neither grammar or spelling

were assessed; only the written expression of the learners' ideas was addressed. Students then shared ideas. The teacher also participated in the writing process and participated in the sharing of ideas process. (See Appendix B)

Upon completion of the six weeks literature session, all students were given an identical post-test that was directly correlated to the literature presented. (See Appendix C)

Data Collection

Session observations were made by the teacher. Time on task was monitored as well as group participation and interaction. Student progress was recorded by the teacher in a variety of ways.

A teacher-made worksheet activity was used to test for acquisition of vocabulary and comprehension skills to Group A. Group A activities were graded by the teacher and shared with students during the next session. Group B students engaged in the shared writing process where students manipulated a variety of writing tools and a variety of strategies were used. Students were praised and encouraged to work to their potential.

Six weeks of instruction was administered to students previous to the evaluation of the students' performance on testing of skills. Students in Group A kept data in their students' reading comprehension workbook log. This data was used to analyze students' acquisition of reading comprehension

skills. Student in Group B received comments from the teacher in their shared writing journal.

Design

A pretest-posttest design was conducted. A t-test of gain scores was utilized to test the following hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference in reading comprehension test scores where the shared writing is used.

H_1: The use of the shared writing process integrated into a reading program will increase reading comprehension.

Summary

This chapter is designed to represent the research methodology and procedures used to compare the effectiveness of the shared writing process when integrated into a elementary language arts program. This study was conducted to determine whether reading comprehension can be increased by integrating the shared writing process into a language arts program.

A pretest was given using the California Test of Basic Skills, comprehension section A and B. Six weeks of instruction was administered to the students prior to an evaluation of the students' performance levels. Observations of the students' progress were made. A t-test was conducted to check for significance. The results and findings are presented in Chapter Four.

Chapter 4:

The Results

The population of this study includes forty(40) second and third grade students from Memorial Elementary School. There are 17 males and 23 females, with a mean age of 8.5 years. Each of the students participated in this study during the regularly scheduled language arts class in a self-contained, heterogeneous classroom.

The Statement of the Problem

The research was designed to investigate the effect, if any, of writing activities on reading comprehension. In the initial phase of the study the C.T.B.S. was administered to all forty (40) subjects. The testing instrument was the C.T.B.S. level 12 Form B. This instrument was chosen because of its comprehensive nature, availability, convenience and wide spread public school use.

The C.T.B.S. as used, has been tested for reliability by using the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20, the standard error of measurement and a Benchmark test-retest study.

The groups were designed so that each contained a comparable number of students with high, low, and average scores. As can be seen in Table I not only were the average scores in each group almost identical but the standard deviation of the scores were identical indicating that these two groups were well matched for this study.

Table I	
	CTBS Results
Control Group	.827 + .121 (SD)
Experimental Group	.830 + .121 (SD)

Statistical analysis of the C.T.B.S. results using the paired t-test revealed a p-value greater than 0.95 (as shown in table II) indicating statistical identity of the two groups.

Table II			
Paired t-test C.T.B.S. Test			
DF:	Mean X-Y:	Paired t value:	Prob. (2-tail):
19	-.002	-.063	.9508

The rationale for setting up the two groups according to C.T.B.S. test results was to avoid as much as possible any significant difference in these groups which would have an adverse affect in the post test results. In essence, the only remaining variable is the educational exercise surrounding the subject, Charlotte's Web. Therefore, if there are any differences in the groups in the post test it can logically be assumed that the difference in educational maneuvers in fact resulted in the difference in comprehension.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be a significant difference in comprehension achievement between the experimental and control groups on the administered test.

Hypothesis Results

The experimental protocol ran as follows: both groups participated in a shared reading activity where the teacher read a chapter per session of Charlotte's Web by E.B. White. After the completion of the shared reading activity, the control group and the experimental group participated in shared writing activities.

The Control Group

The control group engaged in reading comprehension activities where one word was solicited to complete the assignment. The activates included the following skills; true/false, matching, the cloze reading approach. The results of the administered test scores were as follows: score 1.00/2 subjects; score .90 /3 subjects; score .80/2 subjects; score .70/4 subjects; score .60/6 subjects; score .50/2 subjects; score .40/1 subject.

The Experimental Group

The experimental group engaged in student reading comprehension assignments where the students manipulated information into creative writing activities. Many shared writing activities were utilized, including the following; reproduction of a Daily Newspaper Article, Letter Writing, Cause and Effect Web, Journal Writing, and Character Assimilation. The results of post test scores were as follows; 1.00/9 subjects; score .90/4 subjects; score .80/1 subjects; score .70/5 subjects; score .60/1 subject.

Comparison of Group Results

Table III	
	Comprehension Test Results
Control Group	.705 + .170
Experimental Group	.875 + .141

As can be noted in Table II the experimental group, which had a more intensive educational experience, scored much better on the comprehension test regarding the subject matter, Charlotte's Web.

Table III illustrates a comparison of the control verses experimental group comprehension test results. Statistical analysis of these results using the paired t-test (see table IV) revealed a p-value less than 0.008, indicating that these results are significantly different.

Table IV			
Comprehension Test Results			
DF:	Mean X-Y:	Paired t value:	Prob:(2-tail):
19	-.17	-2.998	<0.008

About the Comprehension Test

The Accelerated Reader computer program is a tool that helps educators efficiently manage a literature-based reading program. The AR system is the application of the new technology of computerized reading management, it is relatively easy to measure reading comprehension reliably and accurately.

This is how the Accelerated Reader computerized reading management system works. Students select a book to read from a recommended book list. The AR system assigns a point value to each book based on the number of words in the book and its reading level, using the well-known Fry Readability Index.

Careful test writing and security features in the software greatly reduce the possibility of student cheating. AR points are considered a fairly accurate measure of the quality of words being read and comprehended; therefore, they constitute an accurate measures of reading practice (Paul, 1996).

Summary

In general terms, Hypothesis I results may be summarized as follows: The experimental group did show a significant difference when compared to the control group, thereby resulting in acceptance of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis II results showed that the experimental group did show a gain in mean scores in both areas of comprehension when compared to the control group, Therefore, the hypothesis of the study that states that reading comprehension will be significantly improved by the use of the shared writing process is accepted.

It should be noted that the experimental as well as the control group have had an extensive shared reading and shared writing experience while attending Memorial Elementary. After extensive research the shared writing process has been

implemented across all curriculum areas. Memorial Elementary students are accustomed to open-ended activities of this nature and are receptive to them. Therefore, the activities were successful.

The treatment resulted in a significantly higher mean score for the experimental group because of an active approach to improving reading comprehension as opposed to a passive approach. The results of the post t-test did reflect a significant difference, thus demonstrating a positive effect on the subjects.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

This study was conducted to investigate the effect, if any, of a planned program of writing activities on reading comprehension. It was found that students in the second grade experimental group did show a significant difference at the .05 level of significance in reading comprehension. An important part of the experimental design was to ensure that the experimental and control groups were as comparable as possible. To this end, the groups were designed based on the C.T.B.S. measurement of reading comprehension.

Although the experimental group made a statistical gain, other significant observations were made. The students participating in the experimental group were working on a higher level of thinking where they were engaged in active tasks in contrast to passive modes of participation. Students in the experimental group were asked to participate in creative writing activities involving recording events, explanations, persuading, inviting a response, predict, inform, invent, giving opinions, and to summarize. Students were in "failure free" classroom environments with activities that solicited cooperative learning and creative freedom. Students were finally encouraged to present their writing initives to the group where a positive reinforcement was guaranteed. Students came to the activity excited and

enthusiastic. Students were using their time, which was a clear indication that the students enjoyed this mode of instruction.

The control group participated in the shared reading activity with the experimental group as well; however, the control group was asked to complete a very straightforward comprehension activity that they were accustomed to in their regular daily reading groups. These students came to the session excited about the shared reading component. However, it was the general feeling of this observer that the experimental group appeared less motivated when they were asked to complete their reading comprehension task. r-Lewis (1981). comprised of ten one word fill in the blank questions. There was little interaction between students or exchange of ideas. No high level of thinking was facilitated and students completed the one task assigned at different times, which placed an additional burden on the proctor.

Finally, why does this work? Many educators are under the assumption that reading or calling out words is simply reading. Reading is a complex process involving many skills beginning at the basic level of letter-sound identification to word analysis and the transportation through many additional skills. The ultimate goal in the teaching of reading, is the comprehension of what has been read. To read, to write, to comprehend is the goal of all language arts programs. The question is whether educators ensure that students do more

than merely call out words or listen to a reader without internalizing what has been read.

When students are asked to write, they are immediately called upon to think. Writing involves a higher order of thinking that includes not only fundamental writing skills but the process of arranging ideas, the manipulation of thoughts and the promotion and development of the writer's creativity.

Conclusion

It appears that reading and writing for meaning are paramount in reading comprehension. When learners are taught to read in conjunction with writing it is assumed that reading and writing are inseparable tools in teaching and increasing reading comprehension (Butler, 1994). Reading can be taught in isolation; however, when writing is incorporated and students assertively interact with the text the presence of comprehension is not in question. When reading and writing are employed simultaneously, comprehension will increase because of the phenomenon that comprehension is required to write. It also appears that the best approach to acquiring comprehension is the teaching of reading and writing in combination. Reading and writing are inseparable processes and the foundations of literacy (Butler, 1996). Literacy expert, Mavie Clay said, "For children who learn to write at the same time as they learn to read, writing, plays a significant part in the early reading process" (Clay, 95).

Limitations

A study of this nature is limited with respect to showing global effects. One of these is the small study population. In addition, while the study shows an overall positive effect, it is not possible to tell how effective this procedure is in different populations.

Recommendations

If further studies in this area are conducted, then several changes in the way the investigation should be conducted can be recommended. These would include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Increase the size of the student population of the experimental and control groups for statistical purposes.
2. Comprehension is such a basic or innate quality in human beings that there is no reason to suspect that this experiment would not be positive in any homogeneous ethnic, racial, or soci-economic test group. However, given the psychological differences in various groups, the quantitative improvements in reading ability related to the shared writing process might be quite different. Studies in homogeneous groups, therefore, might point out differences which would be useful in tailoring alterations in approach in different population.
3. The children involved in the study were treated to activities that: (1) increase their awareness of the relationship of speaking, reading, and writing; (2) expanded their vocabulary; (3) improved style and form in writing; and (4) gave the child the opportunity to integrate, assimilate and organize ideas and information.

In conclusion, the findings of this study have direct implication for improving reading comprehension by using writing activities.

Appendix A

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 1 & 2)

Name _____ Date _____

1. Why did Mr. Arable take an axe to the barn?

_____

2. Why did Mr. Arable allow Fern to keep the runt?

_____

3. How did Fern feel about "the pig"?

_____

4. When Fern was in class, what was she dreaming about?

_____

5. How did Fern feed Wilbur when he was young?

_____

6. What did Fern and Wilbur do for fun?

_____

7. Why did Fern have to sell Wilbur?

_____

8. Who did Fern sell Wilbur to?

_____

9. How much did Fern charge for her pig?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 3 & 4)

Name _____ Date _____

1. The barn where Wilbur was to live was
   a. a nice place for a pig
   b. not a nice place for a pig

2. Was Fern allowed to take Wilbur out of the pig pen?

_____

3. Was Fern allowed to get in the pig pen with Wilbur?

_____

4. How did Wilbur feel when he got used to living in the barn?

_____

5. Who talked Wilbur into escaping from the barn?

_____

6. What happened when Wilbur escaped from the barn?

_____

7. How did this make Wilbur feel?

_____

8. Who is Lurvy?

_____

9. Who is Templeton?

_____

10. Why is Wilbur so sad?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 5 & 6)

Name _____ Date _____

1. Why could Wilbur not sleep?

_____

2. What was the goose doing all night?

_____

3. What does salutation mean?

_____

4. Who is Charlotte?

_____

5. What does Charlotte do that makes Wilbur sick?

_____

6. What season is it now?

_____

7. What is one word that describes Templeton?

_____

8. How manu goslings hatched in the goose's nest?

_____

9. What do you think will happen next?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 7 & 8)

Name _____ Date _____

1. Why was Wilbur upset with his new friend?

_____

2. What did the goose tell Wilbur about what would happen to him around Christmas time?

_____

3. How did Wilbur feel about his fate?

_____

4. Why was Mrs. Arable concerned with Fern?

_____

5. Is this story real or fantasy?

_____

6. Why is this story real or fantasy?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 9 & 10)

Name _____ **Date** _____

1. What did Wilbur think that he could do that Charlotte could do?

_____

2. Wilbur needed a string, where did he get it?

_____

3. Why did Charlotte build her web above Wilbur's pig pen?

_____

4. Wilbur does not need to know how to spin a web to trap food. Why?

_____

5. How is Charlotte going to save Wilbur's life?

_____

6. What was Avery going to do to the spider web?

_____

7. What happened to Avery that stopped him from capturing the spider?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 11 & 12)

Name _____ **Date** _____

1. What was the first message on Charlotte's Web?

_____

2. Who find the message?

_____

3. Did Charlotte's trick work?

_____

4. Who did Mr. Zuckerman tell after he told his wife?

_____

5. What did the minister tell Mr. Zuckerman to do?

_____

6. How did the message in Charlotte's Web change thinks around the farm?

_____

Draw a picture of what the Zuckerman's farm looks like since Charlotte played her trick to save Wilbur's life.

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 13 & 14)

Name _____ Date _____

1. Who was missing from the meetings?

_____

2. What was the new message?

_____

3. Who helped find the new message?

_____

4. How did Templeton help with the new message?

_____

5. Why did Templeton help with the new message?

_____

6. How did the Zuckerman's feel about the new message?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 15 & 16)

Name _____ Date _____

1. Charlotte told a story about her cousin. What was the story about?

_____

2. How did Fern's mother feel about the story?

_____

3. Who did Mrs. Arable go to see about Fern's "so-called" imaginary friends?

_____

4. What advice did Dr. Dorian give to Mrs. Arable?

_____

5. Did Wilbur become "stuck up" because of all the attention he was receiving?

_____

6. Charlotte said that she could not come to the County Fair with Wilbur. Why?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 17 & 18)

Name _____ Date _____

1. Why did Fern wear a pretty dress to the fair?

_____

2. What did the sign say on Mr. Zuckerman's truck?

_____

3. What kind of bath did Mrs. Zuckerman give Wilbur?

_____

4. Why did Charlotte decide to come to the fair?

_____

5. Why did Templeton decide to come to the fair?

_____

6. Why did Wilbur pass out?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 19 & 20)

Name _____ Date _____

1. What did the sign say on the side of Wilbur's crate?

_____

2. What was the pig like on the other side of Wilbur?

_____

3. What was the pig's name?

_____

4. Who is Fern's friend?

_____

5. Did Templeton enjoy finding words for Charlotte to write in her web?

_____

6. What was the last word that Charlotte wrote in her web?

_____

7. Did Fern and her family have a nice time at the fair?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 20 & 21)

Name _____ Date _____

1. What was Charlotte's great work?

_____

2. How many eggs are in the sac?

_____

3. What was Templeton's first night at the fair like for him?

_____

4. What did Charlotte's new sign say?

_____

5. Does Fern know how the messages are getting into the web?

_____

6. Which pig won first prize, Wilbur or Uncle?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 22 & 23)

Name _____ **Date** _____

1. What was Charlotte's plan from the very beginning?

_____

2. Did her plan work and how do you know?

_____

3. Where do the people at the fair think that the writing on the web came from?

_____

4. What was the prize awarded to Homer Zuckerman for Wilbur's famous web?

_____

5. Wilbur became very exited during such a complimentary speech, How did Wilbur react?

_____

6. What did Templeton do to save the pig?

_____

Appendix B

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 1 & 2)

Name _____ Date _____

Wilbur and Fern have just come into each other's lives. How does Wilbur feel about Fern? Why? How does Fern Feel about Wilbur? Why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 3 & 4)

Name _____ Date _____

Fern is keeping a journal of her days events. Pretend that you are Fern and you are writing in your journal and telling about the days spent on Uncle Zuckerman's farm. Also, draw a picture and include as many details as you can.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 5 & 6)

Name _____ Date _____

if you had to be Fern or Charlotte in a school play, which character would you play and why? Who would be your barnyard friends?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 7 & 8)

Name _____ Date _____

You are Wilbur, why are you so sad? Write a letter to Fern and tell her how you feel about living in Uncle Homer's barn. Include your "big escape".

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 9 & 10)

Name _____ Date _____

1. What did Wilbur think that he could do that Charlotte could do?

_____ 2. Wilbur needed a string, where did he get it?

_____

3. Why did Charlotte build her web above Wilbur's pig pen?

_____

4. Wilbur does not need to know how to spin a web to trap food. Why?

_____

5. How is Charlotte going to save Wilbur's life?

_____

6. What was Avery going to do to the spider Web?

_____

7. What happened to Avery that stopped him from capturing the spider?

_____

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 11 & 12)

Name _____ **Date** _____

EXTRA

EXTRA

Read all about it!!!!!

by _____

Write a newspaper article to report the "miracle" in the barn.

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 13 & 14)

Name _____ Date _____

What did Dr. Dorian say about Fern's "Stories."

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

List 5 things that are .....

FANTASY AND REALITY 1. ___

_____ 1. _____2. _____

____ 2. _____3. _____ 3.

_____4. _____ 4. _____

_____ 5. _____ 5. _____

_

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 15 & 16)

Name _____ Date _____

Draw the famous webs and include the famous message.

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 19 & 20 & 21)

Name _____ Date _____

Please retell the end of the story beginning with the last day at the fair.

Charlotte's Web (Chapter 17 & 18)

Name _____ **Date** _____

Pretend that you are Wilbur and you are sending a postcard all of Zuckerman's barnyard animals that did not get to go to the county fair. Write a postcard and describe to them what they have missed.

	TO:
	FROM:

Appendix C

Charlotte's Webb
by
E.B. White

Name_____**Date**_____

1. What made Mr. Arable decide not to kill the runt?

   a) Mrs. Arable wanted it to be Fern's 4-H project.
   b) Fern begged him not to.
   c) The Humane Society might make a fuss.
   d) Avery said he'd find a home for it.

2. Why did Fern sell Wilbur?

   a) She wanted the money.
   b) He was fighting with the other pigs.
   c) He was expensive to feed.
   d) He kept getting into the garden.

3. Who told Wilbur they'd save him form being killed?

   a) Avery
   b) Fern
   c) Charlotte
   d) Templeton

4. Why did the Zuckermans believe they had an unusual pig?

   a) Wilbur looked very intelligent.
   b) Fern had taught him to do tricks.
   c) Fern told them Wilbur could talk.
   d) "SOME PIG" was woven into Charlotte's Web.

5. How did the goose egg get broken?

   a) Lurvy stepped on it while trying to catch Wilbur.
   b) Templeton broke it when he tried to steal it.
   c) Avery broke it trying to capture Charlotte.
   d) Wilbur accidentally sat on it.

6. What was the second message Charlotte wrote?

a) "SUPER"
b) "TERRIFIC"
c) "FANTASTIC"
d) "SUPREME"

7. What did Dr. Dorian advise Mrs. Arable to do about Fern?

a) Encourage her interest in Henry Fussy.
b) Give her dancing lessons to distract her.
c) Keep her away from Zuckerman's.
d) Let her associate with her friends in the barn.

8. What did Charlotte call her "magnum opus" or great work?

a) Her project to save Wilbur.
b) Her egg sack.
c) The web with "HUMBLE" written in it.
d) Her trip to the County Fair.

9. How did Charlotte's egg sac get back to the barn?

a) Charlotte attached it to Wilbur's crate.
b) Templeton carried it back.
c) Wilbur carried it in his mouth.
d) Fern put it in her pocket.

10. How did Charlotte die?

a) Avery hit her with a stick.
b) She died naturally after laying her eggs.
c) Fair officials had sprayed poison to kill insects.
d) Henry Fussy accidentally stepped on her.

Bibliography

Allen, J. B. (1991, March). I'm Really Worried About Joseph: Reducing the Risks of Literacy Learning. Reading Teacher, 44 (7), 458-472.

Butler, Andrea (1994). A literature -Based Reading Program

C.T.B.S. 4, Technical Report; McGraw-Hill, 1990

Calkins, R. M. (1982). Writing Taps a New Energy Source: The Child. Exter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

Carbo, M. (1987 November). Deprogramming Reading Failure: Giving Unequal Learners an Equal Chance. Phi-Delta-Kappan, 69 (3), 197-202.

Chall, Jeanne S., Hacobs, Vicki A. (1983). Writing and Reading in the Elementary Grades: Developmental Trends Among Low ses Children. Language Arts, 60 (5), 17-26.

Combs, W.E. (1977). Sentence-Combining Practice Aids Reading Comprehension. Journal of Reading, 21, 18-24.

Cunningham, P. M. (1995). Phonics They Use. 2nd Ed. Harper Collins College Publishers.

Doctorow, M., Wittrock, M.C., & Marks, C. (1978). Generative Processes in Reading Comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 109-118.

Eldredge, L. (1991, Spring). An Experiment with a Modified Whole Language Approach in First-Grade Classrooms. Reading Research and Instruction, 30(3), 21-38.

Farr, R., Lewis, M., Fasholz, J., Pinsky, E., Towle, S. Lipschutz, J., and Faulds, B. P. (1990, March). Writing in Response to Reading. Educational Leadership. 66-69.

Flood, J., Mathison, C., Lapp, D., & Singer, H. (1989). Reading Comprehension Performance: The Effects of Teacher Presentations and Text Features. Reading Research and Instructions, 29, 1-11.

Glover, J., Plake, B., Roberts, B., Zimmer, J., & Palmere, M. (1981). Distinctivess of Encoding: The Effects of Paraphrasing and Drawing Inferences on Memory from Prose. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 736-744.

Griffiths, R., Duncan, J., Ward, R., Hood, H., Hervey, S., and Bonallack, J. (1992) Dancing with the Pen, The Learner as a Writer. Ministry of Educator, Wellington, New Zealand.

Hansen, J. (1987). When Writers Read. Heinemann Portsouth, NH.

Head, M.H., Readence, J.E., Buss, R.R.(1989). An Examination of Summary Writing as a Measure of Reading Comprehension. Reading Research and Instruction, 28, 1-11.

Heald-Taylor, G. (1989). The Administrator's Guide to Whole Language. New York: Richard Owen Publishers.

Holland, K., and Hall, L. E. (1989, Winter). Reading Achievement in First Grade Classrooms: A Comparison of Basal and Whole Language Approaches. Reading Improvement, 26 (4), 323-329.

Klesius, J. (1991, Winter). A Whole Language and Traditional Instruction Comparison: Overall Effectiveness and Development of the Alphabetic Principle. Reading Research and Instruction, 30 (2), 47-61.

Kulhavy, R.W., Dyer, J.W., & Silver, L. (1975). The Effects of Notetaking and Test Expectancy on the Learning of Text Material. Journal of Educational Research. 68. 363-365.

Looby, T. N. (1986). Improved Reading Achievement of Sixth Grade Students when using a Whole Language Approach In Conjunction with a Basal Reading Program. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 04-A.

Manning, M. M., Manning, G. L., Long, R., and Wolfson, B. J. (1987). Reading and Writing in the Primary Grades. National Education Association, Washington D. C.

McKenna, M., Robinson, R., and Miller, J. (1990, November). Whole Language: A research Agenda for the Nineties. Educational Researcher, 3-6.

Mooney, M. E. (1990). Reading to, with, and by Children. Owen Publishers, New York.

Mooney, M. E. Burnett, J., and Coote, P. (1985). Reading in Junior Classes. Ministry of Education, Wellington, New Zeland.

Newman, J. M., and Church, S. M. (1990, September). Myths of Whole Language. The Reading Teacher, 44(1), 20-26.

Otto, W., Wolf, A., & Eldridge, R.G. (1984). Handbook of Reading Research, New York: Longman Publications.

Phinney, M. (1986). The Administrator's Guide to Whole Language. Unpublished Report. New York: Richard Owen Publishers.

Readence, J. E., and Martin, M. A. (1988). Comprehension Assessment: Alternatives to Standard Test. In S. M. Glazer, L. W. Searfoss, and L. M. Gentile (Eds.), Reexamining Reading Diagnosis: New Trends and Procedures. (pp. 67-80). Newark, Deleware: International Reading Association.

Reutzel, D. R., and Cooter, R. B. (1990 May-June). Whole Language: Comparative Effects on First-Grade Reading Achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 83 (5), 252-257.

Ribowsky, H. (1985). The Effects of Code Emphasis Approach and a Whole Language Upon Emergent Literacy of Kindergarten Children. (ERIC Report Document No. CS 008 397)

Robbins, P. A. (1989). Implementing Whole Language: Bridging Children and Books. Educational Leadership. pp. 50-54.

Shapiro, J., and Gunderson, L. (1988 Winter). A Comparison of Vocabulary Generated by Grad 1 Students in Whole Language Classrooms and Basal Reader Vocabulary. Reading Research and Instruction, 27(2), 40-46.

Slaughter, H. B., Haussler, M. M., Franks, A. S., Jilbert, K. A., and Silentman, I. J. (1985). Contextual differences in Oral and Written Discourse During Early Literacy Instruction. (Report No. CS-008-125). Tucson, AZ: Tucson Unified School District (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 380)

Squire, J.R. International Encyclopedia of Education. (1985). New York: Pergamon Press.

Stotsky, Sandra. (1983). Research on Reading/Writing Relationship: A synthesis and Suggested Directions. Language Arts, 60 (5), 627-642.

Taylor, K. (1978). If Not Grammar, What? Taking Remedial Writing Instruction Seriously. (Report No. CS-204-163). Chicago, IL: Illinois Center College.

Turbill, J. (1985). Now, We want to Write! Bridge Printery, Rosebery, N. S. W.

Turbill, J. (1990). No Better Way to Teach Writing. Bridge Printery, Rosebery, N. S. W.

Varable, M.E. (1990, May-June). Analysis of writing samples of students taught by teachers using whole language and traditional approaches. Journal of Education Research, 83 (5), 245-251.

Walker-Lewis, H. (1981). Using Writing to Improve the Reading Comprehension Abilities of Academically Underprepared College Students. (Doctoral Dissertation, Hofstra University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 2053A.

Weaver, L. (1988). Reading Process and Practice. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

Wittrock, M.C. "Writing and the Teaching of Reading." Language Arts 5 (1983): 600-6.